

1985

Familiarity and the Attribution Process

Donald Mark Allen

College of William & Mary - Arts & Sciences

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Allen, Donald Mark, "Familiarity and the Attribution Process" (1985). *Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects*. Paper 1539625326.

<https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21220/s2-kb7n-ep42>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

FAMILIARITY AND THE ATTRIBUTION PROCESS

A Thesis

Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Psychology
The College of William and Mary

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirement for the Degree of
Masters of Arts

by
Donald M. Allen

1985

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirement for the degree of

Masters of Arts

Donald M. Allen
Author

Approved, April 1984

John B. Nezlek
John B. Nezlek

Deborah Foss-Goodman
Deborah Foss-Goodman

Peter Derks
Peter Derks

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	2
CHAPTER II. METHODS	14
CHAPTER III. RESULTS	19
CHAPTER IV. DISCUSSION	31
REFERENCES	37
TABLES	40
APPENDIX	52

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my thesis committee, Deborah Foss-Goodman and Peter Derks, and my advisor, John B. Nezlek, for their assistance with the investigation. Their ability to laugh and be scientists at the same time was very appreciated.

I would also like to thank my fellow graduate students for making my experience here slightly more bearable.

A special expression of gratitude goes to my parents, Dale and Dorothy Allen, for their support, both financial and emotional.

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my girlfriend, Stacy L. Mitchell, for her friendship, companionship, tolerance and her ability to maintain our relationship through a telephone line.

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Means of self trait ratings for Time and Vignette...	40
2.	Means of self situational ratings for Vignette, Time and Sex	41
3.	Means of self trait and situational ratings for Vignette	42
4.	Means of trait ratings for roommates and others for Vignette, Time and Sex	43
5.	Means of situational ratings for roommate-other comparison for Vignette and Sex	44
6.	Means of trait and situational ratings of roommates and others for Vignette	45
7.	Means of trait and situational ratings of roommates and others	46
8.	Means of trait and situational ratings for roommates and others for Perspective and Sex	47
9.	Means of trait ratings for the three perspectives for Vignettes	48
10.	Means of situational ratings for Perspective, Time and Sex	49
11.	Means of trait and situational ratings for Perspectives and Vignette	50
12.	Means of attributions for Perspective, Time and Sex	51

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the changes that occur in a person's attributions to a target individual as the person becomes better acquainted with the target.

Freshman and their roommates completed questionnaires that asked them to make situational and trait attributions to their own behavior, to the behavior of their roommates and the behavior of the average same sex freshman given four hypothetical situations. The questionnaire was administered twice, during the fourth and the fourteenth week of their first semester.

Changes in trait and situational attributions were observed between the two administrations. Differences were found between the attributions made to the four vignettes, between sexes and between perspectives.

It is suggested that the differences were in part a function of the changes in familiarity between subject and roommate, and in part a function of the change in familiarity between subjects and roommates, and in part a function of the differences in vignette content.

FAMILIARITY AND THE ATTRIBUTION PROCESS

Chapter 1

Research in the area of causal attributions originated with Heider (1958), when he proposed that individuals are inclined to make attributions for their own behaviors and the behaviors of others in an attempt to predict and control the world around them. He made the initial distinction between two causal attribution categories, dispositional and situational. Dispositional attributions were those that explained behavior in terms of the ability and effort of the actor, whereas situational attributions consisted of characteristics particular to the situation such as difficulty, luck, or environmental factors. Causal attribution researchers have consistently found a tendency for actors to make situational attributions for their behavior, while observers have a tendency to make dispositional attributions for the behavior of others (Goldberg, 1978; Nisbett, Caputo, Legant & Maracek, 1973). Nisbett et al. (1973) asked subjects to describe themselves and four other stimulus persons using a set of 20 polar opposite traits, given the "depends on situation" option described earlier. The stimulus persons employed were the subjects, their best friends, their fathers, an admired acquaintance, and Walter Cronkite. The researchers found that subjects were significantly more likely to apply the situational option to

their own behavior than to any of the four stimulus persons. Although the researchers found no significant differences across the four stimulus persons they did find a significant negative correlation between the length of time subjects had known their best friends and the tendency for them to describe the friend's behavior in dispositional terms. The longer the subjects had known their best friend, the less willing the subjects were to assign traits to them. They assumed that longer acquaintance resulted in greater familiarity.

Goldberg (1978) found that when subjects were asked to describe their own behavior and the behavior of another, given a choice between a set of trait terms and the option "depends on situation" (characteristics of the situation), subjects tended to describe their own behavior in situational terms and use more trait descriptors in explaining the behavior of others. Other research also supports this position (Nisbett et al., 1973; Storms, 1973).

Jones and Nisbett (1973) and later Kelley and Michela (1980) proposed a cognitive explanation for this actor-observer difference in terms of historical information. They hypothesized that people explain their own behaviors more in situational terms because they have more knowledge of their inconsistencies across situations. On the other hand, when explaining the behaviors of unacquainted others, observers

have little information about such actors' behavioral histories, and thus trait attributions are used to explain these actors' behavior. Within this framework, knowledge of actors' past behaviors across different situations, should increase the number of situational attributions made to actors' behavior and decrease the number of trait attributions made.

Contrary to these findings, Monson and Snyder (1977) suggested that in many situations traits will become more salient and over time, trait attributions will be important as descriptors of behavior. Behaviors that are consistent across situations are suggestive of personality characteristics and allow easier prediction of future behavior. They found that actors made more dispositional attributions to their own behavior than did observers. These findings are contrary to those expected under the situational paradigm (an increase in situational attributions with an increase in familiarity) but are consistent with the findings of others (Monson and Snyder, 1984; Langer & Roth, 1975; Miller & Norman, 1975). A study by Monson, Tanke and Lund (1980), involving college fraternity members, found that subjects attributed more personality traits to themselves than were attributed to them by their fellow fraternity members. Harvey, Town, and Yarkin (1981) contended that predicting more traits to an individuals

behavior, familiar or unfamiliar, "may be both logically and empirically tenable." Furthermore, the more familiar a subject was with the target person, the greater the number of trait attributions assigned to him (Monson et al., 1980) .

Following from the findings above, Kerber and Singleton (1984) asked subjects to make attributions to themselves, three friends, and three acquaintances, (using the procedure employed by Jones and Nisbett (1973)). Their results were consistent with previous results (Monson et al., 1980) , subjects made greater trait attributions to their friends than they did to acquaintances. Kerber and Singleton also had the friends and acquaintances make attributions to the subject. They found that actors made more situational attributions to their own behaviors than did observers but the two did not differ in their trait attributions. Kerber and Singleton concluded that familiarity appears to influence the attribution process, but differentially for trait and situational attributions, triats attributions would increase while situational attributions would remain the same. They also stated that greater familiarity may lead to both more accurate and more favorable attributions. This is consistent with Neimeyer, Neimeyer and Landfield's (1983) finding that members of self-disclosure groups became more accurate in their prediction of one anothers' self-ratings on a personal

construct checklist after interacting with one another over a fourteen week period.

Research in the area of the actor-observer difference can be described as inconsistent at best. For example, the research by Nisbett et al. (1973) has been employed by both those that support the increase in situational attributions accompanying knowledge of a subjects' behavioral history (Goldberg, 1978) and those that support the trait position (Monson & Snyder, 1977; Monson, Tanke & Lunde, 1980; Kerber & Singleton, 1984). The situationalists when describing the Nisbett et al. research, point out that subjects indicated that the "depends on situation" option provided the best description of the causes of their actions in any one situation. They also describe the linear relationship reported by Nisbett et al. between the use of the "depends on the situation" option and level of acquaintance with the target individual. Subjects were more likely to use this option in describing their own behavior and were least likely to use it when describing the behavior of Walter Cronkite (Goldberg, 1978).

Researchers supporting the trait position employ the same research to support their position. They point out that when subjects made trait attributions for the four target individuals (who differed in their degree of familiarity with

the subject) they failed to differentiate their responses across the four targets. That is, the number of traits assigned to subjects' fathers did not differ from those assigned to Walter Cronkite. These results are inconsistent with the situationists' position, which would predict an increase in situational attributions as familiarity increases. However, they also are inconsistent with the results that would be expected by the trait supporters, who would predict an increase in trait attributions with increased familiarity.

One of the major problems with the familiarity research is the inconsistency across research methods (Goldberg, 1978; Solomon, 1978). These two groups of researchers use different research procedures, and measures. Different researchers do not gather the same type of data, yet all claim to be investigating the actor-observer effect. A typical experiment investigating the actor-observer effect provides subjects with a list of polar opposite traits. Subjects are required to assign one of two polar opposite traits to their own behavior and to the behavior of a target person (e.g. Kerber & Singleton, 1984). Research showing increases in situational attributions with increased familiarity has given subjects the "depends on situation" option. Conversely, the research that has shown an increase in trait attributions has failed to give subjects this option.

A second methodological flaw in past research is the failure on the part of the experimenters to control for the degree of familiarity between subjects and the people about whom they make attributions. Subjects have typically been asked to think of their best friend when making attributions and with no measure of length of friendship being taken (Goldberg, 1978; Kerber & Singleton, 1984; Nisbett et al., 1973). Thus, no differentiation has been made between subjects who knew their best friends for six weeks and those who had known them for six years.

The most important point made concerning the methods used in the actor-observer research was introduced by Solomon (1978). He suggested that there is an underlying assumption that situational and dispositional attributions are diametrically opposed. That is, an increase in situational attributions will result in a decrease in trait attributions. This is evident in the measures used that require subjects to decide whether a trait or a situational attribution is more appropriate as opposed to allowing subjects to make both situational and trait attributions for the same behavior. Solomon supported this contention by referring to a study by Taylor and Koivumaki (1973). Taylor and Koivumaki failed to find a significant inverse relationship between situational and trait attributions when subjects were given the

opportunity to make these attributions on separate scales. It is important to note the theoretical implications that these findings have for attribution research. It has long been assumed that situational and trait attributions were inversely related, that an increase in one resulted in a decrease in the other. Research by Taylor and Koivumaki (1973) and Miller, Smith and Uleman (1981) failed to find this inverse relationship, suggesting that people do not view trait and situational factors as opposite ends of one continuum.

Although Solomon (1978) introduced this argument supporting the separation of trait and situational attribution measures over six years ago his suggestion has not been incorporated into research investigating the effects of historical data on the attribution process. Kerber and Singleton (1984), in their recent article, failed to adopt this procedure and reported results consistent with previous research using similar techniques (Monson & Snyder, 1977; Monson, Tanke & Lunde, 1980). The present study adopted Solomon's suggestion. It is expected that its results will differ from previous research in that both situational and trait attributions will increase as familiarity increases.

There appears to be a relationship between knowledge of a target person's behavioral history and the actor-observer effect. As we become more familiar with a target our

Goldberg, 1978; Nisbett et al., 1973) .

Kerber and Singleton (1984) found that familiarity, defined "as the frequency of contact between two individuals across a variety of situations" (p. 208), affected the attribution process differentially for trait versus situational attributions. They found that trait attributions increased with the level of familiarity between subject and target, but situational attributions were unchanged by this increase. Their research failed to replicate completely the actor-observer effect. They found that subjects made a greater number of situational attributions to their own behavior compared to those made to others, but there was no difference between their self trait attribution and the trait attributions they made to others. It is hypothesized that the type of attribution rating system used by the researchers resulted in their findings. The failure to measure trait and situational attributions separately resulted in subjects inability to express their attributional beliefs. By giving subjects the opportunity to make these separate predictions, they will show an increase in situational attributions as familiarity with the target increases, but without a corresponding change in trait attributions.

The present investigation employed college freshman as subjects, people who had roommates with whom they were

Goldberg, 1978; Nisbett et al., 1973) .

Kerber and Singleton (1984) found that familiarity, defined "as the frequency of contact between two individuals across a variety of situations" (p. 208), affected the attribution process differentially for trait versus situational attributions. They found that trait attributions increased with the level of familiarity between subject and target, but situational attributions were unchanged by this increase. Their research failed to replicate completely the actor-observer effect. They found that subjects made a greater number of situational attributions to their own behavior compared to those made to others, but there was no difference between their self trait attribution and the trait attributions they made to others. It is hypothesized that the type of attribution rating system used by the researchers resulted in their findings. The failure to measure trait and situational attributions separately resulted in subjects inability to express their attributional beliefs. By giving subjects the opportunity to make these separate predictions, they will show an increase in situational attributions as familiarity with the target increases, but without a corresponding change in trait attributions.

The present investigation employed college freshman as subjects, people who had roommates with whom they were

unacquainted prior to attending the university. Subjects made situational and trait attributions to their own behavior, their roommate's behavior and the behavior of a hypothetical other described as "the average same sex freshman" given four hypothetical situations that required a decision between two behaviors. Subjects made these ratings twice during the course of the semester, once during the fourth week of classes and the second time during the fourteenth week of classes.

The first experimental hypothesis combines the argument made by Solomon (1978) and the results reported by Kerber and Singleton (1984) in predicting that as familiarity with the roommate increases, both trait and situational attributions made to that roommate's behavior will increase. The second hypothesis concerns attributions about the "average same sex freshman." It is predicted that, over time, both trait and situational attributions will increase for this group also.

It is hypothesized that the strength of the relationship between subject and roommate will influence subjects' attributions to the roommates' behaviors. A stronger relationship between subject and roommate is hypothesized to result in higher situational attributions than relationships that involve a weaker relationship. The final hypothesis concerns the actor-observer bias. It is predicted that the investigation will replicate previous findings showing a

tendency for subjects to make higher situational ratings to their own behavior than dispositional ratings (Harvey et al., 1981) .

Chapter 2

Method

Subjects. Subjects were 96 male and 140 female, freshmen at The College of William and Mary some of whom received credit toward fulfillment of a class requirement. Subjects were roommate pairs who were unacquainted prior to attending the university. Nine subjects were eliminated from the data analysis due to incomplete questionnaires or because they reported that they were acquainted with their roommate before coming to William and Mary.

Procedure. During the fourth and fourteenth weeks of classes subjects and roommates were presented with a two part questionnaire. The first part of the questionnaire contained four brief vignettes that asked the subjects to place themselves in a particular situation in which a succession of events culminated into a choice between two behavioral alternatives. Two of the four stories were adopted from Ross, Greene and House (1977), The Term Paper Story and The Traffic Ticket story. Both were slightly modified to account for present social and economic conditions (see Appendix A). The Term Paper story asked subjects to make a choice between doing a term paper in a group of three people or individually. The Traffic Ticket story describes a situation where the subjects are issued a speeding ticket and find that the information on

the court summons is incorrect. Subjects were asked whether they would pay the fine, which we upgraded from \$20.00 to \$40.00, or whether they would appear in court to contest the ticket.

The other two stories were composed in an attempt to address interpersonal situations and to match the format of the two Ross et al. stories as closely as possible. The two stories are reproduced below:

The Concert Story

As you are studying for a quiz in your room, a group of friends stops by and asks you to go with them to a concert which you had previously expressed some interest in attending. You think to yourself that you really would like to go to the concert since this is the only time this particular group will be performing and that you would enjoy going with your friends. Although you have done some studying for the quiz you are sure you are not as well prepared as you would like to be for the quiz and you know you will not be in any condition to study after the concert.

The Blind Date Story

A good friend ask you to go on a double date. The date is to be informal and inexpensive. You have never met your prospective date but your friend has described this person as attractive and having a good personality. Although you are good friends, you and your friend have not always agreed as to what constitutes attractiveness. Furthermore, you have heard through the grapevine that you friend has approached other people with the same deal and has been refused.

After reading each particular story subjects were asked to decide which of two behavioral alternatives they would choose and then asked a number of questions pertaining to that

behavioral choice (see Appendix A). Specifically, subjects were asked to rate on a 6 point Likert scale, how likely it was that they would make the choice they had made. Next they were asked how much they thought their own personal traits, past experiences, thoughts and feelings (trait attributions) would influence their choice. On a separate scale they were asked how influential the characteristics or aspects of the situation (situational attributions) would influence their choice. These two questions employed a seven point Likert scale, the endpoints were "not at all influential" (1) and "extremely influential" (7). The final question asked subjects how certain they were of their answers describing their behavior. The endpoints were "not at all certain" (1) and "very certain" (6).

Subjects were then asked the same six questions but these questions referred to their roommate's behaviors and attributions about those behaviors. Finally, subjects were asked to respond to four of the six questions (see Appendix A) in the manner they thought the average same sex William and Mary freshman would.

Following these judgements, subjects predicted the percent of William and Mary same sex freshman students who would chose the behavioral alternatives in each situation. They also rated how familiar they were, their roommates were,

and the average William and Mary same sex freshman was, with the situation using a seven point Likert scale, where the endpoints were: "not very familiar" (1) and "very familiar" (7).

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of the twenty question Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell, Peplau and Cutrona, 1980). Following this, subjects answered sixteen questions that evaluated their relationships with their roommates. These questions can be broken down into two types, those that concerned the direct relationship between the two individuals, and those that concerned how similar their attitudes were on certain mutually relevant topics. The relationship questions concerned: the length of time the two individuals had known each other before attending college, how friendly they felt toward their roommate, how friendly they thought their roommate felt toward them, how well acquainted they felt they were with their roommate and lastly, how much time the two of them spent together.

The second set of questions asked how similar the subjects felt they were to their roommates on the topics of general moral principles, ways in which they relate to the opposite sex peers, ways in which they relate to same sex peers, and how concerned they were with being in a group as opposed to being alone. These ratings roughly corresponded to

each of the four vignettes. Subjects were asked how knowledgeable they were regarding their roommates' attitudes on each particular topic.

The adverbs used to describe the various points on the Likert scales were obtained from Cliff's (1959) research on adverbs as multipliers.

Chapter 3

Results

Overview

The data are presented in three sections. The first section contains analyses of the subjects' trait and situational attributions to their behavior. The second section contains analyses comparing subjects' attributions to their roommate's and other's (described as the average William and Mary same sex freshman). The last section compares the attributions subjects' made to their own behaviors to those made to their roommate's and other's behaviors. All comparisons included analyses of differences among the four vignettes (Concert, Date, Paper and Ticket), times (Time1, Time2), sex (Male and Female) and in the latter two, analyses of perspective (Self, Roommate and Other).

Self: Trait Attributions.

Analysis of subjects' trait ratings of their own predicted behaviors in the four situations resulted in a significant main effect for sex, $F(1, 209) = 7.80, p < .01$, with females ($M = 5.43$) making higher trait ratings than males ($M = 5.13$). Analysis of the effects of vignette resulted in a significant Vignette effect, $F(3, 627) = 15.71, p < .001$, with the Paper vignette ($M = 5.65$) receiving the highest trait ratings followed by Concert ($M = 5.27$), Ticket

(\bar{M} = 5.24), and finally by the Date vignette (\bar{M} = 4.98). The Vignette X Time interaction was also significant, $F(3, 627) = 3.23$, $p < .05$. Examination of the means presented in Table 1 suggests that over time, subjects trait ratings for the Concert, Paper, and Ticket vignettes increased, while those made to the Date vignette decreased.

Insert Table 1 about here

Self: Situational Ratings.

Similar analyses of subjects' situational ratings resulted in a significant main effect for sex, $F(1, 209) = 14.94$, $p < .001$, again with female (\bar{M} = 5.29) making higher overall ratings compared to males (\bar{M} = 4.88). A main effect for Vignette, $F(3, 627) = 7.92$, $p < .001$, was also found, with the Concert vignette (\bar{M} = 5.33) receiving the highest situational ratings, followed by the Paper vignette (\bar{M} = 5.08), the Date vignette (\bar{M} = 5.07) and lastly by the Ticket vignette (\bar{M} = 4.87).

The Time X Sex interaction was significant, $F(1, 209) = 3.96$, $p < .05$, as was the Vignette X Time X Sex interaction, $F(3, 627) = 3.07$, $p < .05$. Examination of the means presented in Table 2 suggests that for both the Concert and Date vignettes, the situational attributions of males decreased over

time, while those made by females increased. For the Paper vignette, males' situational ratings remain relatively stable over time, while those of females increased. Conversely, for the Ticket vignette the opposite occurs, male ratings increased, while those made by females decrease.

Insert Table 2 about here

Self: Trait-situational attributions.

Results not relevant to the situation-trait attribution comparisons will not be discussed in this paper (no main effects other than the Attribution main effect and no interactions that do not involve the Attribution variable). A 2 (Sex) X 2 (Perspective) X 4 (Vignette) X 2 (Time) X 2 (Attribution) analysis of variance was performed to compare trait and situational attributions. This comparison resulted in a significant effect for type of attribution, $F(1, 209) = 13.38$. Subjects made higher trait ratings ($M = 5.28$), overall, compared to situational attributions ($M = 5.09$). There was also a significant main effect for Vignette, $F(3, 627) = 12.51$, $p < .001$. However, there was also a significant Attribution X Vignette interaction, $F(3, 627) = 11.25$, $p < .001$. The means presented in Table 3 suggest that subjects made more situational attributions to the Paper and Ticket

vignettes, but made smaller distinctions in the opposite directions for the Concert and Date vignettes.

Insert Table 3 about here

Roommates and others: Trait attributions.

Analyses to determine if the expected changes in the relationship between roommates actually took place resulted in supportive evidence. Subjects reported feeling better acquainted with their roommates at Time2 ($M = 5.23$) then at Time1 ($M = 4.92$), $F(1, 210) = 14.19$, $p < .001$. Females ($M = 5.26$) reported feeling better acquainted, overall, with their roommates than did males ($M = 4.88$), $F(1, 210) = 5.49$, $p < .02$. Subjects also scored lower on the Loneliness scale at Time2 ($M = 36.49$), then at Time1 ($M = 37.70$), $F(1, 212) = 11.88$, $p < .001$, with no differences between the scores of males and females. Although roommates reported being better acquainted with their roommates at Time2, they did not report feeling more friendly overtime, or feeling that their roommates felt more friendly towards them. However, females ($M = 5.62$) reported feeling more friendly toward their roommates overall, compared to males ($M = 5.25$), $F(1, 211) = 4.97$, $p < .05$.

Analysis of covariance comparing the subjects'

attributions to roommates and others, using level of acquaintance, knowledge and perceived similarity of attitudes and opinions, did not result in any significant effects. To examine the effects that familiarity may have on the attribution process, comparisons were made between subjects ratings of their roommates, and of a hypothetical, presumable relatively unfamiliar person (other). A 2 (Sex) X 2 (Perspective) X 4 (Vignette) X 2 (Time) analysis of variance was used to examine the trait ratings subjects made to these two target persons resulted in a significant main effect for sex, $F(1, 193) = 4.15, p < .05$. Once again, females made higher overall trait ratings. Subjects made higher trait ratings to their roommate's behavior ($M = 5.00$) compared to those made to others ($M = 4.88$), $F(1, 193) = 10.36, p < .01$.

Vignette differences produced a significant main effect, $F(3, 579) = 3.42, p < .05$, as did Time, $F(1, 193) = 3.77, p < .05$, however, these effects were qualified in a significant Vignette X Time X Sex interaction, $F(3, 579) = 4.44, p < .01$. The data, presented in Table 4, present the means for this triple interaction. For the Concert and Ticket vignettes, males and females made higher trait ratings over time, although these increases were smaller for the females. However, for the Date vignette, males made higher ratings over time, while females made lower trait ratings. In contrast,

for the Paper vignette, females trait ratings increased with time while males decreased slightly.

Insert Table 4 about here

Roommate-other: Situational ratings.

Sex differences were again found when situational ratings were analyzed for roommate-other differences, $F(1, 194) = 7.57, p < .01$, females made higher situational ratings than males. A main effect for Vignette, $F(3, 502) = 6.43, p < .001$, was also found as well as a significant Perspective X Vignette X Sex interaction, $F(3, 582) = 3.19, p < .05$. The means for the interaction are presented in Table 5.

Insert Table 5 about here

Males made stronger situational attributions to their roommates' behaviors than to others' behaviors for the Concert and Date vignettes, while females showed differences in the opposite direction. When making situational attributions to the Paper vignette, males made higher situational ratings for their roommates, while females don't appear to differentiate between roommates and others. The opposite condition is apparent for the Ticket vignette, with males not

differentiating between roommates and others, while females make higher other situational ratings.

Roommate and others: Trait and situational attributions.

When trait and situational attributions were combined and analyzed, using a 2 (Sex) X 2 (Perspective) X 4 (Vignette) X 2 (Time) X 2 (Attribution) ANOVA, the Attribution X Vignette interaction, was significant, $F(3, 576) = 6.27, p < .001$. Comparison of the means shown in Table 6 suggests that subjects made higher trait ratings compared to situational ratings for the Concert and Date vignettes, while the opposite was true for the Paper and Ticket vignettes.

Insert Table 6 about here

The Attribution X Perspective interaction was also significant, $F(1, 192) = 10.63, p < .001$. Comparison of the means, presented in Table 7, suggests that subjects made similar situational ratings to others ($M = 4.98$) compared to trait ratings ($M = 4.87$), while at the same time making higher trait ratings ($M = 5.01$) compared to situational ratings ($M = 4.93$) for their roommates. These results support the findings of Kerber and Singleton (1984) and others who have suggested that as familiarity increases a person attributes more traits to the target individual.

Insert Table 7 about here

A significant Perspective X Vignette X Sex interaction was found, $F(3, 576) = 4.29$, $p < .01$, the means of this interaction are presented in Table 8. Inspection of the means suggests that males tend to make higher ratings for their roommates compared to others across all of the vignettes, with only a slight increase for the Ticket vignette. Females, on the other hand, tended to make higher overall ratings to their roommates' behavior for the Concert, Paper, and Ticket vignettes, while making higher ratings for others for the Date vignette.

Insert Table 8 about here

Perspective differences: Trait attributions.

Analysis comparing self trait ratings with roommate and other resulted in a significant main effect for perspective, $F(2, 384) = 42.47$, $p < .001$, and a main effect for Vignette, $F(3, 576) = 12.31$, $p < .001$. The Perspective X Vignette interaction was, however, also significant, $F(6, 1152) = 5.92$, $p < .001$. The means of this interaction are presented in Table 9. Comparison of the means suggests that the

interaction is a product of subjects' self ratings. They were unevenly distributed across the four vignettes, and consistently higher in all four vignettes for self ratings. This appears to have elevated the means for the three vignettes, while not having the same effect on the fourth.

Insert Table 9 about here

Perspective differences: Situational attributions.

When subjects' situational attributions were analyzed for Perspective differences a significant main effect for sex was again found, $F(1, 193) = 11.25, p < .001$, and as in all of other analyses, females made greater overall ratings. As in the roommate-other analysis there was a significant main effect for Vignette $F(3, 579) = 8.97, p < .001$. The addition of the of the self ratings also resulted in a main effect for perspective, $F(2, 306) = 6.63, p < .001$. The situational ratings were highest for roommates, followed by self ratings and lastly by ratings of others. This inclusion of self ratings did not produce a Perspective X Vignette X Sex interaction as was found in the roommate-other analysis. However, it did produce a Perspective X Time X Sex interaction, $F(2, 386) = 5.34, p < .05$. This analysis is noteworthy since it did not include some of the vignette

differences that have prevailed throughout the analyses. Examination of the means, presented in Table 10, suggests that females did not change their situational attributions to the behavior of their roommates or others over time, as they did for their own behaviors. Males, however, increased situational ratings of their roommates behavior, slightly increased them to others behavior, and slightly decreased situational attributions to their own behavior.

Insert Table 10 about here

Perpsective differences: Trait and situational attributions.

When trait and situational attributions were compared for the three perspectives, using a 2 (Sex) X 3 (Perspective) X 4 (Vignette) X 2 (Time) X 2 (Attributions), there was a significant main effect for Perspective, $F(2, 302) = 32.41$, $p < .001$, and Vignette, $F(3, 573) = 9.31$, $p < .001$. The Attribution X Vignette interaction was significant, $F(3, 573) = 11.70$, $p < .001$, this effect combined with the significant Perspective X Vignette interaction, $F(6, 1146) = 4.00$, $p < .001$, produced a significant Attribution X Perspective X Vignette interaction, $F(6, 1146) = 2.42$, $p < .05$. The means of this triple interaction are presented in Table 11. Examination of the means suggests that subjects made the

highest ratings when describing their own behavior, followed next by the ratings they made to their roommates' behavior and the lowest ratings were those made to the behavior of others. A less pronounced linear trend is evident for the situational ratings. Subjects, once again, made the highest ratings to their own behavior, followed by ratings of others and finally by ratings of roommates' behavior. When comparing situational to trait attributions it appears that subjects' ratings do not differ when rating their own and their roommates' behavior for the Concert and Date vignettes, however, trait ratings were favored when rating the Paper and Ticket vignettes. This pattern is reversed when others' ratings were looked at. Little difference was found between trait and situational ratings for the Paper and Ticket vignettes, but higher situational ratings were made in rating the Concert and Date vignettes.

Insert Table 11 about here

The Perspective X Time X Sex interaction was also significant, $F(2, 382) = 5.32, p < .006$. The means, presented in Table 12, suggest that subjects made a definite distinction between themselves and others (roommates and others) when making attributions. This suggests that they

made both higher trait and situational ratings when describing their own behavior compared to when they were describing the behaviors of their roommates and others. This effect was not affected by time. Subjects failed to make a clear distinction between roommates and others attributions when the time factor was eliminated.

Insert Table 12 about here

Chapter 4

Discussion

Familiarity and Attributions.

The two hypothesis that predicted an increase in situational and trait attributions with an increase in familiarity with the target person were partially supported by the data. Subjects did not increase their situational attributions to their roommates behavior, or to the behavior of the "average same sex freshman" as a function of time. However, subjects did, for some of the vignettes, increase their trait attributions to both roommates and others as a function of time. This pattern differed for males and females, however. Males increased their trait ratings for the Concert, Date, and Ticket vignettes over time, while decreasing their trait attribuions to the Paper vignette. Females also increased their trait ratings for three of the four vignettes (Concert, Date, and Paper), while decreasing them for the fourth (Ticket).

The results matched those reported by Kerber and Singleton (1984). They found that as familiarity with a target person increased, trait attributions increased, but situational attributions remained unchanged. They reported differences between attributions made to friends and acquaintances, with friends representing the group that

subjects were familiar with and acquaintances representing the group that they were unfamiliar with. The present research did not replicate these findings. Subjects did not differentiate between roommates and others when making trait attributions to their behavior. It is hypothesized that the failure to replicate Kerber and Singleton's findings may have been a result of the formulation of the questions concerning roommate and "average same sex freshman." Subjects may have used their roommates as examples of the average same sex freshman, given that the roommate is probably the most available and accessible example of this group. This would explain the lack of difference between trait ratings of roommate and other but would not, however, explain the differences between the situational attributions made to the two groups (see Table 5). These differences are difficult to explain in terms of familiarity, although situational attributions do not appear to be affected by this factor.

Subjects did not use trait attributions more than situational attributions when describing the behavior of their roommates and others. Higher situational attributions were made to the Concert and Date vignettes, but higher trait ratings were made to the Paper and Ticket vignettes. This adds little to the argument of the relative importance of either one of the two types of attributions being more

important to subjects when they make attributions to the behavior of others.

Subject-roommate relationship and attribution.

It was hypothesized that stronger roommate relationships would result in higher trait attributions than weaker relationships. The results of this study did not support this hypothesis. When relationship quality was used as a covariate it did not affect the differences found in the study. This suggests that the strength of the relationship between people do not affect the attribution process.

Self-attributions

It was hypothesized that, in agreement with previous research, subjects would make higher situational attributions than trait attributions when describing their own behavior (Jones and Nisbett, 1973; Nisbett et al., 1973). The present results supported these previous findings but not for all four of the vignettes. Subjects made greater situational attributions to their own behavior for the Paper and Ticket vignettes but not for the Concert and Date vignettes, where they showed greater trait attributions.

Interestingly, subjects' self-ratings for both trait and situational attributions changed over time. When making trait ratings, subjects increased these ratings over time for three of the four vignettes (Concert, Paper, and Ticket), but showed

a decrease in these ratings for the fourth vignette (Date). For situational attributions there was a discernable difference in the way males and females changed their ratings over time. Males increased their ratings on two of the vignettes (Concert and Date), held them relatively constant for the third (Paper) and decreased them for the fourth (Ticket). Females, on the other hand, showed an increase in situational ratings for three of the vignettes (Concert, Date and Paper) and for the fourth (Ticket) vignette showed a slight decrease in their ratings. Although a reason for the increase in situational ratings over time is not readily apparent, it may be that subjects were more familiar with the vignette characteristics during the second administration of the questionnaire. The differences in male-female situational attributions appear to follow a pattern. Both males and females showed an increase in situational attributions for both the Concert and Date vignettes, but differed on their attributions to the Paper and Ticket vignettes. It may be that characteristics of the latter two vignettes led to different response patterns, but no specific explanation can be offered at this time.

Conclusions

The results from the present investigation partially supported the experimental hypothesis of an increase in both

situational and trait attributions as familiarity increases. These results were consistent with research that has shown that subjects view trait attributions as accurate descriptors of human behavior (Harvey et al., 1981; Monson et al., 1980). Previous research has suggested that as someone becomes more familiar with another, trait attributions will increase while situational attributions will remain the same. It was suggested that previous results supporting this position were the result of differences in research method in the measurement of subjects' attributions. Solomon (1978) discussed the problems involved with measuring trait and situational attributions on the same scale and it was expected that these same problems contributed to the previous research results. This was not the case however. The present research used a different procedure from that used in previous research, yet found the same results. Thus, increases in trait attributions and no change in situational attributions may be a function of familiarity and as familiarity increases so do trait attributions.

The results from the present research suggest that the effects of familiarity on the attribution process are not consistent across situations. Although familiarity was found to have an effect on a subjects' attributions, these effects were not consistent across the four vignettes. The vignettes

employed in the study were not chosen to represent a random sample of all possible situations. They were, instead, chosen because two of them had been used in previous research (The Paper Story and The Ticket Story, Ross et al., 1977). The other two were designed, following a similar format, with the intention of studying more interpersonal factors not addressed in the Paper and Ticket vignettes. Variations in the vignettes resulted in different trait and situational attributions among subject's self, roommate and other ratings. Future research should address these issue of situational differences when looking at attributions, particularly when familiarity is an experimental variable.

References

- Cliff, N. (1959). Adverbs as multipliers. Psychological Review, 66, 27-42.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1978). Differential attribution of trait-descriptive terms to oneself as compared to well-liked, neutral and disliked others: A psychometric analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 1012-1028.
- Harvey, J.H., Town, J.P., & Yankin, K.L. (1981). How fundamental is the "fundamental attribution error"? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 346-349.
- Heider, F. (1958). The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley.
- Jones, E. & Nisbett, R. (1972). The actor and the observer: Divergent perceptions of the causes of behavior. In E. E. Jones et al. (Eds.), Attribution: Perceiving the Causes of Behavior. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press.
- Kelley, H.H., & Michela, J.L. (1980). Attribution theory and research. In M.R. Rosenwig & L.W. Porter (Eds.), Annual Review of Psychology: Volume 31 (pp. 457-501). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews Inc.
- Kerber, K. W. & Singleton, R. (1984). Trait and situational attributions in a naturalistic setting: Familiarity, liking, and attribution validity. Journal of Personality,

52, 205-219.

Langer, E.J., & Roth, J. (1975). Heads I win, tails its chance: Illusion of control as a function of outcomes in a purely chance task. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 951-955.

Miller, D.T., & Norman, S.A. (1975). Actor-observer differences in perceptions of effective control. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 23-42.

Miller, F. D., Smith, E. R. & Uleman, J. (1981). Measurement and interpretation of situational and dispositional attributions. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 17, 80-95.

Monson, T.C., & Snyder, M. (1977). Actors, observers, and the attribution process: Toward a reconceptualization. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 13, 89-111.

Monson, T. C., Tanke, E. D., & Lund, J. (1980). Determinants of social perception in a naturalistic setting. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 13, 89-111.

Neimeyer, R. A., Neimeyer, G. J. & Landfield, A. W. (1983). Conceptual differentiation, integration and empathic prediction. Journal of Personality, 51, 185-191.

Nisbett, R. E., Caputo, C., Legant, P. & Marecek, J. (1973). Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27, 154-164.

Ross, L., Greene, D. & House, P. (1977). The "false consensus

effect": An egocentric bias in social perception and attribution processes. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 13, 279-301.

Russell, D., Peplau, L. A. & Cutrona, C. E. (1980). The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 472-480.

Solomon, S. (1978). Measuring dispositional and situational attributions. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 4, 589-594.

Storms, M.D. (1973). Videotape and the attribution process: Reversing actors and observers points of view. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27, 165-175.

Taylor, S. E. & Koivumaki, J. H. (1975). The perception of self and others: Acquaintanceship, affect, and actor-observer differences. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33, 403-408.

Table 1
Means of self trait ratings for Time and Vignette

Vignette	Time		
	Time1	Time2	(T2-T1)
Concert	5.20	5.33	+.13
Date	5.11	4.85	-.26
Paper	5.59	5.71	+.12
Ticket	5.17	5.31	+.14

Table 2
Means of self situational ratings for
Vignette, Time, and Sex

		Time		
Vignette		Time1	Time2	(T2-T1)
Concert	Males	5.34	5.01	-.33
	Females	5.39	5.60	+.21
Date	Males	4.98	4.78	-.20
	Females	5.13	5.39	+.26
Paper	Males	4.87	4.83	-.04
	Females	5.11	5.48	+.37
Ticket	Males	4.47	4.75	+.28
	Females	5.15	5.10	-.05

Table 3

Means of self trait and situational ratings for Vignettes

Attribution	Vignette			
	Concert	Date	Paper	Ticket
Trait	5.27	4.98	5.65	5.24
Situation	5.33	5.07	5.08	4.87
(Situation-Trait)	-.06	-.11	+.57	+.37

Table 4

Means of trait ratings for roommates and others
for Vignette, Time and Sex

		Time		
Vignette		Time1	Time2	(T2-T1)
Concert	Males	4.69	4.98	+.29
	Females	5.09	5.18	+.09
Date	Males	4.64	4.82	+.18
	Females	5.06	4.87	-.19
Paper	Males	4.96	4.92	-.04
	Females	4.95	5.24	+.29
Ticket	Males	4.80	4.95	+.15
	Females	4.93	5.00	+.07

Table 5
Means of situational ratings for roommate-other
comparison for Perspective, Vignette and Sex

		Perspective		
Vignette		Roommate	Other	(O-R)
Concert	Males	5.07	4.91	-.16
	Females	5.16	5.25	+.08
Date	Males	4.89	4.77	-.12
	Females	5.08	5.30	+.22
Paper	Males	4.68	4.88	+.20
	Females	5.12	5.10	-.02
Ticket	Males	4.73	4.72	-.01
	Females	4.84	4.93	+.09

Table 6
Means of trait and situational attributions of roommate
and other for Vignette

Attribution	Vignette			
	Concert	Date	Paper	Ticket
Trait	4.99	4.85	5.02	4.96
Situation	5.09	5.00	4.95	4.80
(Trait-Situation)	-.10	-.15	+.07	+.16

Table 7
Means of trait and situational attributions
for roommates and others

Attribution	Perspective	
	Roommate	Other
Trait	5.01	4.93
Situation	4.88	4.98
(Situation-Trait)	+.13	-.05

Table 8
Means of trait and situational ratings for roommates
and others for Vignette, and Sex

		Perspective		
Vignette		Roommate	Other	(R-O)
Concert	Males	4.98	4.83	+.15
	Females	5.21	5.14	+.07
Date	Males	4.83	4.72	+.11
	Females	5.02	5.14	-.12
Paper	Males	4.81	4.92	+.11
	Females	5.17	5.01	+.16
Ticket	Males	4.81	4.78	+.03
	Females	5.06	4.89	+.17

Table 9
Means of trait ratings for the three Perspectives
for Vignettes

Perspective	Vignettes			
	Concert	Date	Paper	Ticket
self	5.26	4.96	5.66	5.22
roommate	5.07	4.87	5.07	5.00
other	4.89	4.83	4.96	4.83

Table 10

Means of situational ratings for Perspective, Time, and Sex

		Perspective		
Sex		Self	Roommate	Other
Male	Time1	4.94	4.73	4.79
	Time2	4.87	4.94	4.86
	(T2-T1)	-.07	+.21	+.07
Female	Time1	5.22	5.05	5.15
	Time2	5.41	5.05	5.15
	(T2-T1)	+.19	0.00	0.00

Table 11
Means of trait and situational ratings for
Perspective and Vignette

		Perspective		
Vignette		Self	Roommate	Other
Concert	Trait	5.22	5.06	4.90
	Situation	5.31	5.06	5.08
	(S-T)	+.08	0.00	+.18
Date	Trait	5.01	4.87	4.83
	Situation	5.05	4.97	5.07
	(S-T)	+.04	+.10	+.24
Paper	Trait	5.43	5.08	4.95
	Situation	5.10	4.90	4.99
	(S-T)	-.33	-.18	+.04
Ticket	Trait	5.20	4.99	4.93
	Situation	4.91	4.73	4.82
	(S-T)	-.29	-.26	-.01

Table 12
Means for attributions for Perspective, Time
and Sex

		Perspective		
		Self	Roommate	Other
Time1	male	5.03	4.70	4.73
	female	5.30	5.70	5.08
Time2	male	4.99	4.94	4.85
	female	5.42	5.10	5.08

Appendix

A study on decision making Donny Allen and Dr. John Nezlek

The present study, conducted by Donny Allen and Dr. Nezlek, is concerned with how people make decisions and how they think others make the same decisions. You will be presented with four hypothetical situations and will be asked to indicate how you, your roommate, and the average William and Mary student of your s would act in each situation.

After each response you will be asked to rate the degree to which you believe the characteristics of the situation (individuals involved, location, the topic of the situation, etc.) and/or the characteristics of the person (personality traits, past experiences, thoughts and feelings, etc.) were important in the decisions you made.

Please answer all of the questions to the best of your ability, putting to use all of the information that you have available to you when making your predictions as you would in a real-life situation. Please take your time when answering the questions, but do not dwell over any particular one.

You will notice that the questions you will be answering are somewhat repetitive. This regularity is necessary to insure the scientific validity of the questionnaire.

The only way to obtain scientifically valid results is for you to answer carefully and accurately. Please concentrate before giving all of your answers. Thank you for your cooperation.

The following pages contain the four situations on which you are asked to make your decisions.

Please place your name and the name of your roommate in the places provided below.

This is only for descriptive purposes and to assure that you receive credit for your participation in the study.

Your Name: _____

Roommate's Name: _____

It is important for you to remember that we assure complete anonymity in your responses. The nature of the research requires us to separate the questionnaires by name. If you have any questions concerning this please ask before beginning the questionnaire.

As you are studying for a quiz in your room, a group of friends stops by and asks you to go with them to a concert which you had previously expressed some interest in attending. You think to yourself that you really would like to go to the concert since this is the only time this particular group will be performing and that you would also enjoy going with your friends. Although you have done some studying for the quiz you are sure you are not as well prepared as you would like to be for the quiz and you know you will not be in any condition to study after the concert. What would you do in this situation? Indicate your choice by checking one of the two options.

_____ Go to the concert

_____ Continue studying for the quiz

Indicate how likely you think it is that you would make this choice.
(circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
extremely likely to continue to study	quite likely to continue to study	somewhat likely to continue to study	somewhat likely to go to the concert	quite likely to go to the concert	extremely likely to go to the concert

How much did you think characteristics or aspects of the situation (persons involved, location, topic of the situation) would influence you in making this choice?
(circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

How much did you think your personal traits, past experiences, thoughts and feelings would influence you in making this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

To what degree could you have done otherwise? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
certainly could not have done otherwise		probably could not have done otherwise		probably could have done otherwise		certainly could have done otherwise

How certain are you of the answers you have given describing your behavior in this situation? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
not at all certain			somewhat certain		very certain

How do you feel your roommate would act in the situation described above? (Check one)

☐ Go to the concert

☐ Continue studying for the quiz

Indicate how likely you think it is that this choice would be made.

1	2	3	4	5	6
extremely likely to continue to study	quite likely to continue to study	somewhat likely to continue to study	somewhat likely to go to the concert	quite likely to go to the concert	extremely likely to go to the concert

How much do you think the personal traits, past experiences, thoughts and feelings of your roommate would influence him or her to make this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

How much do you think the characteristics or aspects of the situation (individuals involved, location, the topic of the situation) would

influence your roommate to make this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

To what degree could your roommate have done otherwise?
(circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
certainly could not have done otherwise		probably could not have done otherwise		probably could have done otherwise		certainly could have done otherwise

How certain are you of the answers you have given describing
your roommate's behavior in this situation? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
not at all certain			somewhat certain		very certain

Using the same situation what choice do you feel the average
William and Mary freshman of your sex would make? (check
one)

_____ Go to the concert

_____ Continue studying for the quiz

How much do you think the personal traits, past experiences,
thoughts or feelings of people would influence their
making this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

How much do you think the characteristics or aspects of the
situation (individuals involved, location, topic of the
situation) would influence people in making this choice?
(circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all		slightly		quite		extremely

influential

influential

influential

influential

How certain are you of the answers you have given about the average William and Mary freshman of your sex regarding this situation? (circle one)

1
not at all
certain

2

3

4

5

somewhat
certain

6
very
certain

What percentage of the average William and Mary freshmen of your sex would make the two choices? (estimates should add to 100%)

_____ % who would go to concert

_____ % who would continue to study for quiz

How familiar are you with the situation described above (has it happen to you or a friend)? (circle one)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

not very
familiar

somewhat
familiar

very
familiar

How familiar do you think your roommate is with this situation (has happened to roommate or roommate knows someone it has happened to)? (circle one)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

not very
familiar

somewhat
familiar

very
familiar

How familiar do you think the average William and Mary freshman of your sex is with the situation? (circle one)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

not very
familiar

somewhat
familiar

very
familiar

You arrive for the first day of class in a course in your major area of study. The professor says that the grade in your course will depend on a paper due the final day of the course. He gives you the option of two alternatives upon which you must vote. You can either do papers individually

in the normal way or you can work in teams of three persons who will submit a single paper between them. He also indicates that you will be allowed to form your own groups. You are informed that he will give out the same number of A's, B's, and C's etc., but that in the first case every student will be graded individually while in the second case all three students who work together will get the same grade. What choice would you make in this situation? (check one)

_____ Vote for the individual paper

_____ Vote for the group paper

Indicate how likely you think it is that you would make this choice. (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
extremely likely to vote for the indiv. paper	quite likely to vote for the indiv. paper	somewhat likely to vote for the indiv. paper	somewhat likely to vote for the group paper	quite likely to vote for the group paper	extremely likely to vote for the group paper

How much did you think your personal traits, past experiences, thoughts and feelings would influence you in making this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

How much did you think characteristics or aspects of the situation (persons involved, location, topic of the situation) would influence you in making this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

To what degree could you have done otherwise? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

certainly
could
not have
done
otherwise

probably
could
not have
done
otherwise

probably
could
have
done
otherwise

certainly
could
have
done
otherwise

How do you feel your roommate would act in the situation described above? (Check one)

_____ Vote for the individual paper

_____ Vote for the group paper

Indicate how likely you think it is that this choice would be made.

1	2	3	4	5	6
extremely likely to vote for the indiv. paper	quite likely to vote for the indiv. paper	somewhat likely to vote for the indiv. paper	somewhat likely to vote for the group paper	quite likely to vote for the group paper	extremely likely to vote for the group paper

How much do you think the personal traits, past experiences, thoughts and feelings of your roommate would influence him or her to make this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

How much do you think the characteristics or aspects of the situation (individuals involved, location, the topic of the situation) would influence your roommate to make this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

To what degree could your roommate have done otherwise?

(circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
certainly could not have done otherwise		probably could not have done otherwise		probably could have done otherwise		certainly could have done otherwise

How certain are you of the answers you have given describing your roommate's behavior in this situation? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
not at all certain			somewhat certain		very certain

Using the same situation what choice do you feel the average William and Mary freshman of your sex would make? (check one)

_____ Vote for the individual paper

_____ Vote for the group paper

How much do you think the personal traits, past experiences, thoughts or feelings of people would influence their making this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

How much do you think the characteristics or aspects of the situation (individuals involved, location, topic of the situation) would influence people in making this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

How certain are you of the answers you have given about the average William and Mary freshman of your sex regarding

this this situation? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
not at all certain			somewhat certain		very certain

What percentage of the average William and Mary freshmen of your sex would make the two choices? (estimates should add to 100%)

_____ % who would vote for the group paper

_____ % would vote for the individual paper

How familiar are you with the situation described above (has it happened to you or a friend)? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
not very familiar				somewhat familiar				very familiar

How familiar do you think your roommate is with this situation (has happened to roommate or roommate knows someone it has happened to)? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
not very familiar				somewhat familiar				very familiar

How familiar do you think the average William and Mary freshman of your sex is with the situation? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
not very familiar				somewhat familiar				very familiar

A good friend asks you to go on a double date. The date is to be informal and inexpensive. You have never met your prospective date but your friend has described this person as attractive and having a good personality. Although you are good friends, you and your friend have not always agreed as to what constitutes attractiveness. Furthermore, you have heard through the grapevine that your friend has

approached other people with the same deal and has been refused. What would you do in this situation? (check one)

_____ Go on the date

_____ Decline your friends offer

Indicate how likely you think it is that you would make this choice. (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
extremely likely to go on the date	quite likely to go on the date	somewhat likely to go on the date	somewhat likely to decline the date	quite likely to decline the date	extremely likely to decline the date

How much did you think your personal traits, past experiences, thoughts and feelings would influence you in making this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

How much did you think characteristics or aspects of the situation (individuals involved, location, topic of the situation) would influence you in making this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

To what degree could you have done otherwise? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
certainly could not have done otherwise		probably could not have done otherwise		probably could have done otherwise		certainly could have done otherwise

How certain are you of the answers you have given describing your behavior in this situation? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
not at all certain			somewhat certain		very certain

How do you feel your roommate would act in the situation described above? (Check one)

_____ Go on the date

_____ Decline your friends offer

Indicate how likely you think it is that this choice would be made.

1	2	3	4	5	6
extremely likely to go on the date	quite likely to go on the date	somewhat likely to go on the date	somewhat likely to decline the date	quite likely to decline the date	extremely likely to decline the date

How much do you think the personal traits, past experiences, thoughts and feelings of your roommate would influence him or her to make this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

How much do you think the characteristics or aspects of the situation (individuals involved, location, the topic of the situation) would influence your roommate to make this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

To what degree could your roommate have done otherwise?

(circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
certainly could not have done otherwise		probably could not have done otherwise		probably could have done otherwise		certainly could have done otherwise

How certain are you of the answers you have given describing your roommate's behavior in this situation? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
not at all certain			somewhat certain		very certain

Using the same situation what choice do you feel the average William and Mary freshman of your sex would make? (check one)

_____ Go on the date

_____ Decline your friends offer

How much do you think the personal traits, past experiences, thoughts or feelings of people would influence their making this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

How much do you think the characteristics or aspects of the situation (individuals involved, location, topic of the situation) would influence people in making this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

How certain are you of the answers you have given about the average William and Mary freshman of your sex regarding

this situation? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
not at all certain			somewhat certain		very certain

What percentage of the average William and Mary freshmen of your sex would make the two choices? (estimates should add to 100%)

_____ % who would go on the date

_____ % who would decline the offer

How familiar are you with the situation described above (has it happened to you or a friend)? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
not very familiar				somewhat familiar				very familiar

How familiar do you think your roommate is with this situation (has happened to roommate or roommate knows someone it has happened to)? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
not very familiar				somewhat familiar				very familiar

How familiar do you think the average William and Mary freshman of your sex is with the situation? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
not very familiar				somewhat familiar				very familiar

While driving through a nearby rural area you are stopped by a county police officer who informs you that you have been clocked (with radar) at 38 miles per hour in a 25-mph zone. You believe this information to be accurate. After the policeman leaves, you inspect your citation and find that the details on the summons regarding weather, visibility, time and location of the violation are highly inaccurate. The citation informs you that you may either pay a \$40 fine

by mail without appearing in court or you must appear in municipal court to contest the charge. What would you do in this situation? (check one)

_____ Pay the ticket

_____ Contest the ticket in court

Indicate how likely you think it is that you would make this choice. (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
extremely likely to pay the ticket	quite likely to pay the ticket	somewhat likely to pay the ticket	somewhat likely to contest the ticket	quite likely to contest the ticket	extremely likely to contest the ticket

How much did you think your personal traits, past experiences, thoughts and feelings would influence you in making this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

How much did you think characteristics or aspects of the situation (persons involved, location, topic of the situation) would influence you in making this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

To what degree could you have done otherwise? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
certainly could not have done otherwise		probably could not have done otherwise		probably could have done otherwise		certainly could have done otherwise

How certain are you of the answers you have given describing your behavior in this situation? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
not at all certain			somewhat certain		very certain

How do you feel your roommate would act in the situation described above? (Check one)

_____ Pay the ticket
 _____ Contest the ticket in court

Indicate how likely you think it is that this choice would be made.

1	2	3	4	5	6
extremely likely to pay the ticket	quite likely to pay the ticket	somewhat likely to pay the ticket	somewhat likely to contest the ticket	quite likely to contest the ticket	extremely likely to contest the ticket

How much do you think the personal traits, past experiences, thoughts and feelings of your roommate would influence him or her to make this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

How much do you think the characteristics or aspects of the situation (individuals involved, location, the topic of the situation) would influence your roommate to make this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

To what degree could your roommate have done otherwise?

(circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
certainly could not have done otherwise		probably could not have done otherwise		probably could have done otherwise		certainly could have done otherwise

How certain are you of the answers you have given describing your roommate's behavior in this situation? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
not at all certain			somewhat certain		very certain

Using the same situation what choice do you feel the average William and Mary freshman of your sex would make? (check one)

_____ Pay the ticket

_____ Contest the ticket in court

How much do you think the personal traits, past experiences, thoughts or feelings of people would influence their making this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

How much do you think the characteristics or aspects of the situation (persons involved, location, topic of the situation) would influence people in making this choice? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all influential		slightly influential		quite influential		extremely influential

How certain are you of the answers you have given about the average William and Mary freshman of your sex regarding this situation? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6
not at all certain			somewhat certain		very certain

What percentage of the average William and Mary freshmen of your sex would make the two choices? (estimates should add to 100%)

_____ % who would pay the ticket

_____ % who would contest the ticket in court

How familiar are you with the situation described above (has it happened to you or a friend)? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
not very familiar				somewhat familiar				very familiar

How familiar do you think your roommate is with this situation (has happened to roommate or roommate knows someone it has happened to)? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
not very familiar				somewhat familiar				very familiar

How familiar do you think the average William and Mary freshman of your sex is with the situation? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
not very familiar				somewhat familiar				very familiar

Indicate how often you feel the way described in each of the following statements. Circle one number for each.

Statement	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
1. I feel in tune with the people around me.	1	2	3	4

2.	I lack companionship.	1	2	3	4
3.	There is no one I can turn to.	1	2	3	4
4.	I do not feel alone.	1	2	3	4
5.	I feel part of a group of friends.	1	2	3	4
6.	I have a lot in common with the people around me.	1	2	3	4
7.	I am no longer close to anyone.	1	2	3	4
8.	My interests and ideas are not shared by those around me.	1	2	3	4
9.	I am an outgoing person.	1	2	3	4
10.	There are people I feel close to.	1	2	3	4
11.	I feel left out.	1	2	3	4
12.	My social relationships are superficial.	1	2	3	4
13.	No one really knows me well.	1	2	3	4
14.	I feel isolated from others.	1	2	3	4
15.	I can find companionship when I want it.	1	2	3	4
16.	There are people who really understand me.	1	2	3	4
17.	I am unhappy being so withdrawn.	1	2	3	4
18.	People are around me but not with me.	1	2	3	4
19.	There are people I can talk to.	1	2	3	4
20.	There are people I can turn to.	1	2	3	4

Please circle the appropriate number in answering the following 19 questions:

1. How well did you know your roommate before you came to William and Mary? (circle one)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

not at slightly quite extremely
all well well

2. How friendly do you feel toward your roommate now? (circle one)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

not at slightly quite extremely
friendly friendly friendly friendly

3. How friendly do you feel your roommate feels toward you? (circle one)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

not at slightly quite extremely
friendly friendly friendly friendly

4. How similar are you and your roommate regarding general moral principles, ideas of what is right and wrong? (circle one)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

very quite somewhat quite very
dissimilar dissimilar similar similar similar

5. How knowledgeable are you about your roommate regarding the topic of moral principles? (circle one)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

not at slightly quite extremely
knowledge- knowledge- knowledge- knowledge-
able able able able

6. How similar are you and your roommate regarding the ways in which you relate to same sex peers? (circle one)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

very dissimilar	quite dissimilar	somewhat similar	quite similar	very similar
--------------------	---------------------	---------------------	------------------	-----------------

7. How knowledgeable are you about your roommate regarding the topic of same sex peers? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at knowledge- able		slightly knowledge- able		quite knowledge- able		extremely knowledge able

8. How similar are you to your roommate regarding the ways in which you relate to opposite sex peers? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very dissimilar	quite dissimilar	somewhat similar		quite similar		very similar		

9. How knowledgeable are you about your roommate regarding the topic of the opposite sex? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at knowledge- able		slightly knowledge- able		quite knowledge- able		extremely knowledge able

10. How similar are you with your roommate regarding how concerned you are with academics? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very dissimilar	quite dissimilar	somewhat similar		quite similar		very similar		

11. How knowledgeable are you about your roommate regarding the topic of academics? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all knowledge- able		slightly knowledge- able		quite knowledge- able		extremely knowledge- able

12. How similar are you to your roommate regarding how

concerned you are with the feelings of your friends?
(circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very dissimilar		quite dissimilar		somewhat similar		quite similar		very similar

13. How knowledgeable are you about your roommate regarding
the topic of friends feelings? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all knowledge- able		slightly knowledge- able		quite knowledge- able		extremely knowledge- able

14. How similar are you and your roommate regarding how
concerned you are with breaking rules? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very dissimilar		quite dissimilar		somewhat similar		quite similar		very similar

15. How knowledgeable are you about your roommate regarding
the topic of rule breaking? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all knowledge- able		slightly knowledge- able		quite knowledge- able		extremely knowledge- able

16. How similar are you and your roommate regarding how
concerned you are with being in a group of people as
opposed to being alone? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
very dissimilar		quite dissimilar		somewhat similar		quite similar		very similar

17. How knowledgeable are you about your roommate regarding
the topic of being alone? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all knowledge-		slightly knowledge-		quite knowledge-		extremely knowledge-

able		able		able		able
18. Overall, how well acquainted are you and your roommate?						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all acquainted		slightly acquainted		quite well acquainted		extremely well acquainted

19. How much time do you spend with your roommate? (circle one)						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
no time at all		very little time		a good deal of time		a great deal of time

VITA

Donald Mark Allen

Born in Fort Ord, California, February 22, 1961.
Graduated from Meade Senior High School in Fort Meade,
Maryland, June 1979, B.A., University of Maryland,
Baltimore County, June 1983. In September 1983, the author
entered the College of William and Mary as a graduate
assistant in the Department of Psychology.